

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/814,917	03/31/2004	Che-Hsiung Hsu	UC0420USNA	6333	
23906 E.I.DU PONT	7590 10/19/200 DE NEMOURS AND	EXAMINER			
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128			WOODWARD, ANA LUCRECIA		
4417 LANCAS			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
WILMINGTO	N, DE 19805		• 1796		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/19/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-Legal.PRC@usa.dupont.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/814,917	HSU, CHE-HSIUNG			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Ana L. Woodward	1796			
Period to	• •	three	orrespondence add	dress		
WHIC - External after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ARANDONE	the mailing date of this co			
Status						
1) ∑ (2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	uly 24, 2007) action is non-final.	uly 6,20	07		
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🔯	ion of Claims Claim(s) $19900000000000000000000000000000000000$	n.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw					
5)\	Claim(s) // is/are allowed.					
6)💢	Claim(s) // is/are allowed. Claim(s) /-/ is/are rejected. 17-20					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the E	xaminer.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti					
11)[_]	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PT	O-152.		
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
* C	application from the International Bureau	` `,'				
* 3	See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.			
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa				
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date 7/6/07	6) Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Application/Control Number: 10/814,917 Page 2

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-7, 13, 14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. 5,300,575 (Jonas et al) as per reasons of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. Claims 8, 9, 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,300,575 (Jonas et al), described hereinabove, in view of U.S. 5,002,700 (Otagawa et al) as per reasons of record.
- 5. Claims 1-9, 13-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,002,700 (Otagawa et al) in view of U.S. 5,300,575 (Jonas et al) and U.S. 5,185,100 (Han et al) as per reasons of record.

Art Unit: 1796

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed July 24, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to applicants' allegation that the polystyrene sulfonic acid of Jonas et al is water-soluble, and thus not colloid-forming, would appear to be contra to the teachings of the reference which are directed to the formation of aqueous dispersions. Jonas et al's polyanions include anions of polymeric carboxylic acids, such as polyacrylic acids, polymethacrylic acids or polymaleic acids, and polymeric sulfonic acids such as polystyrene sulfonic acids and polyvinyl sulfonic acids. These polycarboxylic acids and polysulfonic acids may also be copolymers of vinyl carboxylic and vinyl sulfonic acids with other polymerizable monomers. These polymeric carboxylic acids and polymeric sulfonic acids appear to be of the same type described in applicants' specification (pages 8-11, etc.) and, as such, there is reasonable basis for believing that they would also be colloid-forming. It is furthermore noted that polymer lattices or polymer dispersions which contain acidic groups as –SO3, --COO and –PO32 can be added to the dispersions to ensure sufficient stability (column 4, lines 63-68). Polymers suitable for these polymer dispersions or lattices would also correspond to the presently claimed colloid-forming polymeric acids (column 5, lines 1-13).

With respect to claims 4 and 5, these claims merely further describe, as opposed to require, the polypyrrole and polyaniline species per claim 1 and, as such, have been incorporated into the rejection based on Jonas et al.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the Jonas et al and Otagawa et al references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established

Art Unit: 1796

by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Otagawa et al's background disclosure provides the teaching that polyaniline and polythiophene are electrically-conducting polymer equivalents and their common use in electrochemical applications. Accordingly, it is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the disclosures of Jonas et al and Otagawa et al are sufficiently similar both in terms of materials and purpose such that the teachings of one are relevant to the other. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have substituted fluorinated sulfonic acid polymer for the polyvinylsulfonic acid expressly used by Jonas et al with the reasonable expectation of success. Absent evidence of unusual or unexpected results, no patentability can be seen in said claimed subject matter.

The results in Table 1 of applicants' specification have been reviewed but are not deemed to be probative of unexpected results for using the non-polymeric acid and colloid-forming polymeric acid in combination. In this regard, it is noted while a comparison has been made with a dispersion containing only non-polymeric acid, none has been made with one containing only colloid-forming polymeric acid. As such, it can not be determined as to whether or not the results obtained in example 1 are the unexpected, as opposed to the expected additive effect of using both the non-polymeric and polymeric acids. In any event, even if the results were demonstrative of unexpected results, the evidence would not be commensurate in scope with the claims, which are not limited to the specific acids shown.

Art Unit: 1796

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claim 16 is allowed. The prior art of record neither anticipates nor renders obvious a buffer layer made from an aqueous dispersion comprising polypyrrole, non-polymeric acid dopant and polymeric perfluoroethylenesulfonic acid.

Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ana L. Woodward whose telephone number is (571) 272-1082. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/814,917

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 57/1-21/2-1000.

Ana L. Woodward Primary Examiner Page 6

Art Unit 1796
